

Shakespeariana

VOL. VI.

FEBRUARY, 1889.

NO. LXII.

*A PLEA FOR A REFERENCE CANON OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS, WITH A UNIFORM SYSTEM OF NOTATION APPLICABLE TO ALL CRITICAL REPRINTS OF THE FOLIO OR QUARTO TEXTS.**



THE Americans are in the habit of saying that time is money. We seldom squander it without occasion. Our lavishness is generally in the hope of some return, either in the way of instant pleasure, or remoter but expected benefit. This is true of all sorts of intellectual time-spenders, but of none truer than of the student of literature. For the field is vast, the bounds of a long lifetime are scarcely sufficient for the satisfactory prosecution of a single branch of research; and as the night draws on and the shadows lengthen few of us care to halt in our review of the ripe golden hoards to winnow away mere chaff, or be otherwise wanton spendthrifts of the precious light that remains. To such, even the waste of minutes is an annoyance, unhappily, of their patience too often demanded.

I propose now, in a practical talk to practical fellow-students, to vent a little spleen upon a grievance from which most of us have too often suffered, namely, the scantiness and faultiness of existing codes of literary reference. Historian, biographer, essayist, can all bear witness to the weary hours of search, the pages thumbed, the shelves emptied, to verify some phrase,

* Read before the New York Shakespeare Society, April 28, 1887.

or perchance a single word, which the behest of criticism demands to be accurately rendered. This is especially the case with the Shakespearian student—for if he be not content to take all his knowledge at second hand—if he be not willingly led by the guide—blind or purblind, it may be—whose hand first grasps his own—if he be ever so slightly devoted to that most enticing and exacting of all branches of critical study which deals with textual intricacies, and which spreads out in review all the opulent stores of philological science in the search for the one bit needed to fit, mosaic-wise, into the finished work—he is at each moment driven to ransack the original authorities, in whatever form they may be accessible to him.

One of the most helpful and hopeful phases of modern critical science is the steady progress toward supplying trustworthy authorities for this class of study. A century ago, the few who realized the need of comparative research among conflicting texts, had little more than happy accident to depend upon, according as fate kindly set in their way, or unkindly withheld, some musty folio or wormy quarto, where, in a passage affording a perfect parallelism of sense, lay the very word required to solve a doubt. To-day, our shelves are crowded with reprints, aiming at an ever-increasing accuracy of reproduction and collation. The labor of learned associations, the Camden, the Percy, the Early English Text, and the Old and New Shakespeare Societies, has been supplemented by the arduous toil, and too often the material sacrifices, of individuals who, like Arber and Grosart, reproduce the treasures of ancient bookdom, until the most casual investigator of our time is far better equipped off-hand than were the Theobalds and Malones, the Steevens and Giffords, of three or four score years since.

With the abundance of material, a nicer dependence upon selection and an accurate use of it becomes more and more imperative. The day of slipshod emendation, of silent adaptation ("convey, the wise it call"), and of unauthorized revision, is gone by. The student has not only the indefeasible right, but the increasing opportunity to follow step by step the process by which a given critical text of Shakespeare is formed, and bear

the testimony of his own good judgment to the soundness of the result, or to revert, himself, to the fountain-heads of authority and weigh equalities with judicial severity.

True, some of the most eminent teachers of Shakespeare hold that it is no business of the student-reader to be studious; that the relation between them is necessarily that of master and disciple, of preceptor and neophyte, not of guide and co-worker. Leo says of the duty of an editor of an ideally perfect text that "Every passage that has succeeded in establishing its title to respect, either by the agreement of the old editions or of later emendators, should be adopted in the text, without the slightest mention of all the arguments for and against, which have hitherto been bandied about respecting it. The mention of them is not of the least advantage to the public, and does not at all advance the purification of the text."* Hudson, peace be with his soul, in his hard-headed, brawny-handed way, lays about him right and left in this wise: "If any one says that common readers, such as at least ninety-nine persons out of a hundred are and must be, should have the details and processes of the work put before them, that so they may be enabled to form independent judgments for themselves—I say, whoever talks in this way is either under a delusion himself, or else means to delude others. It may flatter common readers to be told that they are just as competent to judge for themselves in these matters as those are who have made a life-long study of them; but the plain truth is, that such readers must perforce either take the results of deep scholarship on trust, *or else not have them at all*; and none but a dupe or a quack, or perhaps a compound of the two, would ever think of representing the matter otherwise."†

Such utterances alike deny the right and refuse the opportunity of general critical study, by summarily crowding the many who enjoy and seek to understand Shakespeare into the herd of "common readers." Therein lies the fallacy, for the reader of Shakespeare is rarely of the common classes to whom Hudson

* F. A. Leo. *Coriolanus*, 1864, p. vi.

† Hudson's *Sh.* Boston, 1881, Vol. I., p. xvi.

addresses himself. The interest to follow the wonder-working Magician through the rush and clash of his metaphor, to be lifted up with him toward the unapproachable and descend with him into the deepest depths of the human soul—and the consciousness that, while it is the voice of a god that speaks, it is a voice that makes us co-heirs of its godhood as it in turn shares the infirmities of our manhood—do not belong to the common reader. Shakespeare is not readable in the same way that a morning newspaper or a society novel is. We read him somehow as we do the Bible, with reverence and faith. And it is just here that the dogmatic teachers go astray; they hold that the Shakespearian canon and text are to be regarded with awe, that not one jot or tittle is to be disturbed, overlooking that it is often their own canon, the mundane creation of their own emendatory judgment, that they set up and into the divinity of which they would forbid the scrutiny of the common scholar. For we have no Shakespearian canon, coming down to us with all the sanction of centuries of undisturbed completeness, and made, through daily association from earliest childhood, the occasion of exposition and comment until its phraseology and inmost import become so woven into our lives that it is a recognizable and immutable standard, as is the case with the Bible. We seem to read the Bible without effort or conscious analysis, until we fancy that its truths come home to us of their own force without exegesis or gloss—but we lose sight of the potential traditions of accumulated early associations, that cling around every familiar word and image, and insensibly aid in building up the meaning into a connected whole. We do not pause to recall, if indeed we ever heeded, the fierce dissensions of the scholiasts as to the right or wrong translation of the words or their title even, to a place in the sacred text—the sonorous English of King James' revisers is for us *the* Bible-word, fresh and unalterable from the lips of Deity—and its meaning is that which our fathers and mothers gave it. With such traditional and venerable sanctity attaching to a canonical text, it is easy to comprehend the feeling of shrinking pain, the sensation of being, as it were, passive spectators of a sacrilege,

with which the masses look upon the late Revised Version. Not even the hands of those who guide the Ark of the Covenant may be put forth to touch it with impunity, though it be to steady it.

Not without amusement could we fancy as many Bibles as editors of the text—some with the Apocryphal books, some without, some eclectically made up from both sources—here an important doctrinal passage omitted, there another inserted, as the varying codices might permit or the erratic predilection of the editors suggest—now the Talmudic legends used to elucidate the Scriptures, now the Avesta Zend or the Koran cited to illustrate the assumed common origin of some dogma or parable; and therewithal the wildest latitude of verbal alteration and structural adaptation, apparently obeying no other criterion than the announcement of the editor that “Moses undoubtedly meant to say thus and thus,” or, “Whatever the scribe may have seemed to make Isaiah say, he could never have intended to write nonsense.” Imagine our reverence and faith pinned upon a Bible that had undergone successive editings by Warburton, Pope, and Johnson, elaborate textual criticism by half a score of Becketts and Zachary Jacksons, and wholesale emendations after the whim of the “Old Corrector” of some Perkins-Collier codex. Might not the common reader who took interest enough in such a text to follow it, endeavor to fathom its problems for himself and weigh probabilities in the balance of his own judgment, even to the extent of rashly venturing on some neat little conjecture of his own?

It is probably too late to hope for the adoption of a Shakespeare text to which the masses may give belief and respect in something the same way they have done to the King James version. Two centuries of editing—God save the mark—have familiarized mankind with the process as far as Shakespeare is concerned, while the absence of such editing for three centuries during which the English language has grown around the Holy Book itself, as it were, thrusting its tendrils into the very substance of it and sucking thence revivifying strength, has made the Bible a thing beyond light change. But is it too late also

to hope for a Shakespearian canon so firmly fixed and so generally accepted as to make it as rash to foist Edward III. or the Two Noble Kinsmen into the series of plays as it would be to include Maccabees, Tobias, or Baruch in some new edition of the Scriptures? If individual whim or reliance upon the application of some abstrusely arbitrary test is to determine—from time to time, with varying results according as the old test varies or new tests are devised—what is or is not Shakespeare, may we not look for some edition in the near future with Mucedorus, Faire Em, or Arden of Feversham cheek by jowl with Timon or Cymbeline—and should we be more tolerant toward such an innovation than our fast traditions forbids us to be to the inclusion in the Sacred Canon of the sublime morality of Jesus, Son of Sirach, or the rich poesy of The Book of Wisdom?

It is evident that a Shakespearian canon of some kind is needed by scholars, and if nothing more can be done—if no Council of Laodicea be practicable—let the consensus of two centuries constrain us to adhere with some show of reverence to the First Folio, with perhaps the addition of Pericles from the Third Folio. A fairly safe canon is found in the First Folio, for Heminge and Condell were something more than accidental editors or interested holders of floating copyrights—they were fellow-actors with Shakespeare, partners with him in his venture of the “Gloabe on the Bancke-side,” and presumably as competent as any men then to be found in King James’ England to announce what plays were legitimately owned by the Company and received and acted by them and their associates in the firm belief of the Shakespearian authorship and under the sanction of the Shakespearian name. Canon or not, in the strict sense of the term, the 1623 Folio is our only warrant for thirty-six dramatic compositions of the later Elizabethan and early Jacobean age, under the authentication of a competent and legitimately interested authority, which certifies to them as Shakespeare’s.

No wonder, then, that this Folio should be the object of especial veneration. There is, to the true Shakespearian, a

sacredness about every line and letter of that volume. Its punctuation, barbarous and riotous as it is, and its uncouth orthography, too, may often suggest plausible construction of doubtful passages, and its very errors are of value because conveying a clue to the resolution of *cruces* found elsewhere in the volume and due to the like "iniurious ftealthes" of the type-setters. There is, in short, no one book on the student's shelves to which he must oftener have recourse. And, unless he has, as the outcome of long years of patient reading and collation, gotten the volume almost by heart, and acquired the knack of putting his finger readily upon any given passage, I, with all earnestness, venture to say that there is no book of reference extant in which it is harder for him to find his place, unless it be a quarto of one of the plays.

Opportunity to consult the First Folio text has been much facilitated by means of reprints of more or less accuracy and more or less popular in character. There are at the present time four accessible reproductions of the whole work, which claim to be in fac-simile, although none of them is absolutely so.

The first attempt was made in 1807, under the editorship of Francis Douce, a genial and painstaking student. Elaborate preparations were made for the work, a special paper being contributed by Whatman with the name of "Shakespeare" and the date "1806" distinctly watermarked. The typographical peculiarities of the original are preserved, even to the errors, as well as was practicable without possessing the identical and badly mixed fonts from which Jaggard and Blount printed their Folio. The title-page with the Droeshout portrait was re-engraved with great care, and so faithfully has the Face been "writ in brasse" that several imperfect copies of the genuine title have been pieced from the Douce reprint. The volume was issued in 1807 by E. & J. Wright, and was heralded as immaculate; but it soon fell into somewhat undeserved disrepute though the laborious effort of William Upcott, of the London Institution, Moorfields, who, at the instigation of the devil and of Professor Porson, devoted 145 days of close atten-

tion to a minute collation of the reprint with a copy of the First Folio. His purpose would not seem to have been wholly disinterested, for we first find him coyly dallying with the greatly alarmed booksellers, to one of whom, Arch of Cornhill, he parted with his list of 368 errata in exchange for a fresh copy of the "pretended" reprint, and thereafter he is discovered hawking the copy so acquired, with all the errata fairly written with a pen, for six guineas—not, truly, a munificent recompense for his "four months and twenty-three days" of misapplied toil which, as we learn from his note in the corrected volume,* ended "Jan. 28, 1809, at three minutes past 12 o'clock." Upcott's copy, with his collations, is according to Dr. J. P. Norris,† in the library of Horace Howard Furness, in Philadelphia, and in a recent letter to me Mr. Furness confirms the statement.

As is shown by a later writer in *Notes and Queries*,‡ only about forty of the errors detected by Upcott have any marked influence upon the text, and of these only half, or less, can be dignified as "readings." The work, of which 250 copies were printed, has become almost as infrequent as a genuine First Folio, and, except in the larger libraries, is inaccessible to the common student.

In 1862-64, Mr. Lionel Booth put forth the well-known type-reduction of the 1623 Folio. The Cambridge Editors say of it, "It is probably the most correct reprint ever issued." Equal precautions against error were probably never before taken. Trustworthy report traces up, through Mr. Sabin, of New York, the assurance of Mr. Booth himself that the proof-sheets had been submitted to the eight best proof-readers in London before they were struck off. The Droeshout portrait, the head ornaments, tail-pieces and initial letters are photo-engraved reductions; the rest is simply reprinted, closely imitating most, but not all, of the typographical peculiarities of the original, even to broken letters, "wrong-font" types, "space-up," etc. But there it stops. The form of the reduced square-quarto

* *Notes and Queries*, Series I., vol. vii., p. 47.

† Article in *American Biblioplist*, June, 1875.

‡ *Notes and Queries*, Series III., vol. vii., p. 139.

page, which is broader in proportion than the Folio, and the "face" of the much smaller type, do not suggest the appearance of the original volume.

The claim to accuracy of the Booth reprint is deservedly high. The publishers, in 1864, on issuing the third part containing the Tragedies, announced "that no errors have been pointed out which have not, on examination, proved to have been errors, or misconceptions, on the part of the critics." And more than twenty years of crucial study, such as no volume of like size and pretensions has ever before undergone, have left its substantial accuracy unimpaired. There are unquestionably variations here and there from original copies and from the later photo-lithographic reproductions; none however, of any importance have been, so far as is known, fixed upon the reprint. And these variations, insignificant as they are, do not necessarily impute want of exactness to the proof-readers of Booth's text, for individual copies of the First Folio differ among themselves more widely than the Booth reprint does from any one of them. Collation of many among the three or four hundred copies of the Folio known to exist indicates that, like most of the books of its time, it suffered correction while passing through the press, and suggests its existence, according to Dr. Ingleby, in at least three states, which he designates as being respectively, of the First, Second and Third Periods.*

*". . . let me say, that all copies of the first Fo. fall into *three classes*.

"The earliest have a peculiar pagination of the *Histories*, and two misprints in III. Henry VI.:

P. 153 is misprinted 163.

P. 164 is misprinted 154.

Also (but not peculiar to these)

165 (is misprinted) 167.

166 (is misprinted) 168.

And on P. 172, col. 2 (*i.e.* III. Hen. VI., V. 7, 25 and 37) *and* is misprinted *add*, and *kis* is misprinted 'tis.

"The next later issue has these two misprints also; and

P. 165 is misprinted 167, and

P. 166 is misprinted 168—

but it has not the two errors of pagination already specified as peculiar to the earliest issue.

Now, we do not know, by authoritative announcement, what particular copy was followed by Booth's proof-readers, nor, indeed, whether a simple copy of the original was adhered to throughout. By Dr. Ingleby's test, it would seem to have been taken from a Third Period copy, such as is the Grenville copy in the British Museum.

Speaking of the variations of the genuine copies of the First Folio, the Cambridge Editors go so far as to say: "It is probable that no one copy exactly corresponds with any other copy," although the discrepancy may often be "in a single letter only." It is, therefore, a fact that, in speaking of the Folio of 1623, we have no one acknowledged standard to which the *variae lectiones* of different copies may be referred, and this is equally true of the reprints as of the originals.

A careful collation which I have had occasion to make of one play, *King Lear*, with Staunton's photo-lithographic reproduction, has strongly exemplified the inconvenience of lacking a standard of reference. A score of differences, thus noted, are reduced by comparison with a copy of the original (Mr. Furness's) to only four, one literal, and three of punctuation. On page 292, column 1, line 6, Booth's reprint reads "King. and" instead of "King, and" as in the original. On page 293, column 2, line 18 from the bottom, "eyes, but" should be "eyes. but". On page 301, column 1, penultimate line, "Yours, in" should be "Yours in." And on page 309, column 2, about half way down, the stage-direction "*He dies.*" should read either "*He dis.*" (Staunton's) "*He dis.*" (Capell's copy, *cit.* Cambridge Editors), or "*Hedis.*" (Furness's copy). There is nothing to prevent the reprint from agreeing with the original followed by Booth's proof-readers, and in the absence

"The latest issue has 'and' 'kis,' and I have found a perfect uniformity of paging and mispacing in all the copies that have those two words correctly. . . . Lord Ellesmere's copy belongs to the Second Period; the Grenville and other B. M. copies belong to the Third Period. These may serve as typical copies." (Letter of C. M. Ingleby to S. A. Allibone, Nov. 8, 1879, quoted in Lenox Library Cat. Works of Sh., 1880, p. 33.)

of knowledge of the precise copy used by them, no positive charge of error can be brought against their work.

A good illustration of this point is found on page 299 of the Folio, column 2, *Scena Sceptima*, line 2, where Booth's text gives "hin," while Staunton's, and several copies of the original, kindly collated for me by Mr. Albert R. Frey, read "him." But Mr. Furness, to whose considerate aid I am much indebted, informs me that *his* copy reads "hin," like Booth's.

The third and most ambitious of the reprints, and the only one rationally deserving the name of "*fac-simile*," appeared in 1866, under the supervision of Mr. Howard Staunton. It is a photo-lithograph, admirably executed, as such work ran twenty years ago, by R. W. Preston, and was announced to be made from the Ellesmere copy in Bridgewater House and from "copies" in the National Library (British Museum). As there are three copies of the 1623 Folio in the British Museum—the Grenville copy (of the Third Period), that in the Royal Library of George III., and one formerly belonging to the Rev. Mor-daunt Chacherode (the Period of which I have not yet ascertained)*—there may possibly be uncertainty that the Staunton fac-simile is not patchworked from four copies of the original, although Winsor says that it was photo-lithographed from two only—the Ellesmere and Grenville copies—"taking a page from one or the other, where its condition best answered his purpose." It is, at any rate, quite uncertain from which copy any particular page is reproduced. This is unfortunate, in view of the different Periods combined, and the many discrepancies between known copies. For this reason alone, Staunton's can never be a universally acceptable standard.

Moreover, despite its inconvenience because representing to the eye the size and "typographical phenomena" of the genuine Folio page, the Staunton fac-simile is not perfect. Photo-lithography has never been a perfected art. What between the eccentricities of the wet-collodion film and the irregularities of the process of transference from the negative to the stone through the medium of a print in unctuous ink, there is an un-

* Winsor's Sh. Bibliography, Boston, 1876, p. 80!

happy mingling of blurring and spreading of the lines in some places and a lack of impression in others. Retouching is unavoidable, even at the present time and—after twenty years of progress; *—and when photo-lithography was still a “newly discovered process” it was necessarily often resorted to. But the moment hand and eye get a chance to intervene in reproductive work, *humanum est errare*. † In the cross-bars of the letter *e* and the *f* and long *s*, and in respect of battered type and punctuation, the Staunton Folio is, in spots, admittedly defective.

The fourth and latest reprint is the reduced photo-lithographic reprint, misnamed “fac-simile,” in small octavo, published by Chatto & Windus in 1876, with an Introduction by the veteran, Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, which, as I take it, is the extent of his connection with the enterprise. Its cheapness, 8s. 6d., is its chief discommendation, for it has been an inducement to put a defective text in the hands of many who are thereby led to suppose themselves “on a level with the envied possessors of the far-famed original.” ‡ The typography is small enough, and the blurring and general sloppiness of the workmanship bad enough, to make its use perilous without a magnifying-glass and a safety-valve. Neither the title-page nor the Preface give any indication of the original copy from which it has been “reduced.” The late Mr. Ingleby, who, with all his virtues and exceeding geniality, indulged at times in needless causticity,

* Mr. Kell . . . the printer of this text—who put on stone the transfers in lithographic ink supplied to him by Mr. Praetorius—states that he has done his very best with the (often faulty) transfers supplied to him. He has lost all his profit, and more, by paying for cleanings and corrections by hand. The Museum copy of the Quarto is bad in some pages, and the negatives required more painting out of letters printed-through, and more cleaning of the transfers than the price of the book would (in the fotografer's opinion) stand. In this work, good transfers from the negatives are all in all.—F. J. F. (Introduction to Praetorius fac-simile, R. & J., 1599.)

† Henceforth, all sheets will be passed for press by the Editor as well as the Lithographer. (Fore-words to Griggs fac-simile, Ven. & Adonis, 1593.)

‡ Halliwell-Phillipps' Preface, p. xi.

spoke of it as "a reduced reproduction of Mr. Staunton's Folio;" and added, "But why is Mr. Staunton not mentioned?"* As to this assertion, I am inclined to suspend judgment, for there are peculiarities in the Chatto & Windus photo-text which do not seem referable to the Staunton.

The reduced type reprint of Booth is so easily attainable at moderate cost that few students, even of the "common" class, will care to be without it. Of the four complete reprints thus far vouchsafed to us, it is probably as safe to refer to the Booth text for the decision of a disputed reading as to any known original of the 1623 Folio, short of the Grenville copy in the British Museum; which, as one of the most perfect of the Third Period copies, and as the standard of the National Library, may be regarded as invested with a pre-eminence of its own to which all conflicting texts must yield. Mr. Furness—than whom no more impartial and capable judge in such matters exists—writes me the following: "It is my settled conviction, founded on an experience of twenty years, that Booth's Reprint is the very best reprint of so large a work that the world has ever seen, or is likely to see. Considering the variations in the copies of F1, I doubt if a single misprint can be fastened upon Booth. Because his reprint differs, no matter how widely, from my original, I shouldn't think of imputing an error to him." It is proper to add that the large-paper copies of Booth's Reprint, which were first issued in three parts, are the most trustworthy, for I have found in the small-paper copies, later issued, in which the serial character of the three parts is abandoned, indications of a deterioration of the presswork inseparable from the printing of a large edition.

Reference to a fairly authentic text is especially necessary if there is to be any serious effort to compare parallel texts, such as of the Folio with the reprints of the earlier Quartos. Ready-prepared parallel texts are not generally accessible. With the exception of the side-by-side reprints of the Folio and First Quarto of Henry V. edited by Dr Nicholson and published in 1877 by the New Shakespeare Society, and the lately printed

* Ingleby: *The Man and the Book*, pt. 1, p. 114, *note*.

parallel Folio and "Pied Bull" texts of *King Lear*, prepared by Professor Vietor, of Marburg, and published by Whittaker in London, I know of none which bring the Folio and the early Quartos into juxtaposition in the manner pursued in our own Society's "Bankside Edition." The New Shakspeare Society announces as in course of preparation parallel texts of the Folio and Quartos of *Richard III.*, of 2 and 3 *Henry VI.* with the *Contention* and the *True Tragedy*, as well as the long delayed Four-text *Hamlet*, begun by the lamented Teena Rochfort-Smith and now finishing by Mr. Furnivall; and a number of others are lavishly suggested. We have also many parallel texts of different Quartos (without the Folio), such as Mr. Sam. Timmins's exquisite reproduction of the Devonshire *Hamlets* (the Quartos of 1603 and 1604), printed by Mr. Josiah Allen at Birmingham, and the New Shakspeare Society's *Romeo and Juliet*, in 1874. The German critics appear to be especially fond of the parallel study of the Quartos.

Until our own Bankside Shakespeare shall furnish a critically edited uniform and exact parallel version of *all* the plays found in quarto and folio form, the ordinary student who seeks to compare a disputed passage or to collate for himself an entire play, has no help for it but to spread out his Folio fac-simile and such Quarto text as he may find, side by side with some modern text as a guide, and peg away.*

It is just here that the loss of time creeps in, of which I so bitterly complain. The problem is, to *find* the parallel passages. Not one of the complete Folio texts has a standard line-notation, to facilitate cross-reference. The few Quarto texts that are line-numbered, follow no co-ordinated system. Each editor adopts his own no-system, and, in the mass, confusion necessarily results. It is worse than the simple absence of a Canon—it is an ever-present conflict and discord.

For a century and a half, from Rowe to the Cambridge Editors, Shakespeare's plays remained without a convenient

*Since Mr. Adeë read this Paper, the N. Y. Shakespeare Society has issued three volumes of the Bankside Edition, with the annotation first suggested by him in this Paper.

scheme of reference numeration. The primitive citation of act and scene was alone available. The labor of finding a hurriedly sought-for line or word in a scene of six or seven hundred lines in length, such as 1 *Henry IV.*, II., iv. (602 lines), or *Hamlet*, II., ii. (634 lines), is appalling, and in the good old days of Mrs. Cowden Clarke's Concordance, before Schmidt or the Globe were, the provocation was often strong to relinquish the search. There were, to be sure, some few editions of separate plays with numbered lines, but they were either school-editions, often expurgated, or Continental reproductions, and no two texts of the same play by different editors would agree. It was not until Clark and Wright, after numbering the line of the Cambridge edition for convenience of collating the foot-notes, conceived the happy thought of numbering the lines of the Globe edition also, that a popular reference Shakespeare lay at hand. Of course, the Globe and Cambridge texts do not agree—the difference in the length of the type-lines and the varying spacing break up the arrangement of all parts where prose is used (as is seen in *Hamlet* II., ii., which counts 581 lines in the Cambridge edition and 634 in the Globe). But the convenience of the natty little single volume of the Globe, with its creamy paper, its singularly clear-faced type, and its cheapness, joined to the natural craving of the human mind for some sort of a canon of uniformity, caused the Shakespearian world to seize upon the Globe as a standard of reference; and the scholar, the professor, and the casual critic have accepted, by a sort of *lex non scripta*, the citation of act, scene, and line of the Globe, even where it is wrong.* And yet, in spite of the alacrity with which the Globe edition was admitted as the line-numbered standard, and the practical universality of its use, not a single modern edition follows throughout the numeration of the Globe. Take, for example, *Hamlet*'s "dull and muddy-mettled rascal," which, according to the Globe: is II., ii., 594—we run it to earth in a few other editions professing to be numbered for

* "The line-numbers are those of the Globe edition, even where they are wrong, as they once or twice are." F. J. Furnivall, Forewords to Griggs's fac-simile Quarto 1, *Love's Labor's Lost*, 1598, p. xv.

"convenience of reference" and find that its number is: in the Cambridge edition and in Furness's Variorum (which follows the Cambridge), 541; Leopold, 575; Rolfe's, 552; Clark and Wright's Clarendon Press series, 548; Richard Grant White's Riverside edition, 535; and Tschischwitz's, 593. Is there not a touch of satire upon the critical faculty of the professional critic, to find that, in three editions by the same editor, W. G. Clark, the same line has three different line numbers? It will probably soon have *four*, for I learn that the Macmillans are about to issue a "Jubilee edition" in *three* volumes, "substantially following the text of the Globe."

Having ascertained the line-number of a particular phrase, according to the Globe standard, this is merely a guide to its approximate position in some other edition, if the latter happen to be line-numbered too. But it is not even a guide to the neighborhood, if the editor mounts some pet hobby and adopts a notation of his own, like Karl Elze, who numbers his *Hamlet* by paragraphs of from 12 to 20 lines continuously throughout the play, which makes our dull and muddy-mettled rascal "peak" in paragraph No. 100. Elze says of this system, "The division into paragraphs . . . is transferable to all editions without any the least difficulty, so that in time a uniform mode of reference may be adopted by the students of Shakespeare in all parts of the habitable globe. It is true that numbering by paragraphs does not enable the student or reader to refer to a particular line, yet the average length of the paragraphs (numbering between twelve and twenty lines) is so convenient that the eye will catch in an instant the passage or word referred to." Leo's earlier *Coriolanus* is divided into 255 sections coincident with the natural pauses or transitions of the dialogue.* Elze's later *Hamlet* has 241 paragraphs.† Craik has broken up *Julius Cæsar* much more generously, having allotted 795 paragraphs to it, on the general plan of numbering each speech, whether of a single word or of many lines.‡

* F. A. Leo. *Coriolanus*, London, 1864. (Gives a photo-lith. of Fi.)

† Karl Elze. *Hamlet*, London, 1882.

‡ Craik. *The English of Shakespeare*, London, 1878.

All paragraphical divisions of the Plays seem to proceed on the assumption that it is practicable to divide a mingling of rapid dialogue and soliloquy into verses, as the Bible was first paragraphed by Robert Stephens in 1551. If it were possible to devise a natural separation into short verses of tolerably uniform length, like the Bible-verses, the scheme would be applicable to all texts and in all languages. But Leo's and Elze's divisions are too long, and those of Craik too irregular, to suggest much hope of an acceptable paragraph-division.

Turning to the Folios and Quartos, we find no canon of notation, and indeed, none is possible which depends on the act, scene, and line division of modern editions.

Of the Quartos published prior to the date of the 1623 Folio, but one has a vestige of act and scene division, and in that one, the *Othello* of 1622, the only divisions are Act II., sc. i.; Act IV., and Act V.

In the First Folio, only six plays are divided into acts and scenes in the same way that the Globe arrange them. Examining the volume, we find of the 36 plays :

I. Six not divided at all,

2 *Henry VI.* 3 *Henry VI.* *Troilus and Cressida.* *Romeo and Juliet.* *Timon of Athens.* *Antony and Cleopatra.*

These all begin bravely with "*Actus Primus. Scena Prima.*" and there an end.

II. Eleven divided into acts only,

Comedy of Errors. *Much Ado.* *Love's Labor's Lost.* *Midsummer Night's Dream.* *Merchant of Venice.* *All's Well.* *Henry V.* *Coriolanus.* *Titus Andronicus.* *Julius Caesar.* *Taming of the Shrew.*

III. One partly divided into acts and scenes :

Hamlet,

which has Act I. divided into 3 scenes, and Act II. into 2 scenes, but the last of these (which begins correspondingly to Act II. sc. ii. of the Globe) runs through the rest of the play.

IV. Twelve are divided into acts and scenes, but these do not agree throughout with the Globe division :

Measure for Measure. King John. Richard II. 1 Henry IV. 2 Henry IV. 1 Henry VI. Richard III. Henry VIII. Macbeth. King Lear. Othello. Cymbeline.

V. Six are divided into acts and scenes which agree throughout with the Globe division :

Tempest. Two Gentlemen. Merry Wives. As You Like It. Twelfth Night. Winter's Tale.

Thus, only one play in six of the First Folio, and not one of the early Quartos, can be implicitly depended upon for the location of a reference to act and scene—which is all that the student has to work upon when he goes to the old texts from Mrs. Cowden-Clarke's Concordance or from any modern edition of the Plays. Even when Schmidt's Lexikon refers him to the Line number, it is but a vague indication of the locality, unless the scene be a short one. There is nothing to be done but to guess about where the passage is that is sought, and then hunt till it is found—if it is there.

It is not always there. Many of the modern texts are made up with the addition of passages from the Quartos which are not found in the Folio, and in few editions is the insertion noted. Singer, Richard Grant White, Charles Knight, and some others follow the convenient method, as old as the time of Johnson and Malone, of bracketing the words or phrases imported into the Folio text, but the editions commonly furnished to the student for purposes of study, such as Rolfe's and the other School texts, and the popular reading editions—such as the Globe, the Handy Volume, the Leopold, and the rest—give no sign in the body of the text that whole passages like the important "dram of eale" speech in *Hamlet*, or the exquisite scene in *Lear*, IV., iii., where "a Gentleman" describes to Kent Cordelia's "demonstration of grief" on hearing of her father's expulsion by the Pelican daughters, Regan and Gonorill, "i' th' storm, i' th' night," are not found in the Folio.

But the labor of lighting upon a passage with which the eye of the searcher is familiarized by a fresh perusal of the context—so that in turning over the Folio or Quarto pages mnemonic guide-posts and mile-stones start up, as it were, to point and

measure the path—is slight compared to that involved in the most common and wearisome employment of the old texts: the hunting down of parallel locutions and similar uses of unusual words, which may serve to interpret the meaning of a doubtful passage. As emendation often brings into apparent relation phrases which have no visible connection in the older authorities, the consultation of the Folios and Quartos is, for this work, indispensable.

I may be permitted to illustrate, by a practical “demonstration,” the interminable circumlocution of such a search, even where the number of instances of supposed parallelism is limited.

Let us assume that I am not entirely satisfied with the accepted reading of Edmund’s phrase in *Lear* :

“Well, my legitimate, if this letter speed,
And my invention thrive, Edmund the base
Shall top the legitimate. I grow; I prosper :
Now, gods, stand up for bastards.”

All the critical editions at command tell me that “top the legitimate” is altered from “to th’ legitimate” of the Old texts, and inform me that “top” means *over-top*. I have some passing doubts about this, and being unwilling to accept an emendation of the authoritative text of the concurring Folios and Quartos without first excluding every interpretation whereby a plausible meaning may be forced out of the old form, it occurs to me that alteration may after all be really needless—that the words “I grow; I prosper :” may perhaps stand for “aye grow, aye prosper,” and that the uncommendably economical printers of the old texts set up *I* for *aye*, as they generally did for *ay*. But, before I can attach any plausibility to my inchoate theory, it behoves me to ascertain whether there is in the old copies any instance of “aye” (meaning *ever, forever, always*) being phonetically and typographically equal to *I* long, instead of being sounded like *a* long, as we employ it, and as there is every reason to suppose the Elizabethan English did.

To begin my unpromising task systematically, I first consult

the Cambridge or Furness's Variorum, to make sure that I have not been anticipated. I find that while "*top* the legitimate" is Capell's generally accepted reading, Pope would have it "*be th' legitimate*," Hanmer wanted to "*toe th' legitimate*," Jennens wished to see Edmund *out* or *rout* his better-born brother, and Mason conjectured "*foe* the legitimate." Not much help there!

Schmidt, in his version of Act I. of *Lear*, would read (*cit.* Furness) "Ay, grow; ay, prosper:"—but *ay* here has the significance of *yea verily*, and is not satisfactory.

I next ascertain by the Globe that the line in question is *Lear*, I., ii., 21. I locate it in Booth's or Staunton's 1623 reprint without trouble, for the Globe division of the first act of *Lear* is found to follow the Folio, and there it reads:

"Shall to' th' Legitimate: I grow, I prosper:"

Then turning to Prætorius' Quarto fac-similes of the Pide Bull and N. Butter texts of 1608, I find the phrase printed as prose, thus:

" . . . Edmund the ase shall tooth' legitimate: I grow, I prosper, now Gods stand vp for Bastards."

The Folio reference may be noted, for convenience, as "p. 286, col. 1, line 3," the Quarto references are, for the Pide Bull, "Q₁, sig. C, lines 12 and 11 from bottom," and for the N. Butter copy, "Q₂, sig. B₂, lines 4 and 3 from bottom."

On opening Mrs. Cowden-Clarke's Concordance, I find 16 cases of "aye," one of which is a compound and is known to be a conjectural reading for the "ayre-remaining" of the Folio. Five examples are of "aye" by itself, the other ten read "for aye." Turning to Dr. Schmidt's Lexikon, I find that he gives all the examples, which he by no means does in every case, for his book is not a concordance, but a dictionary. The 16 instances occur in *Tro. and Cres.* and *Timon* (which are not divided), *Mid. Night's Dream* (which is divided into acts only), *Hamlet* (which while purporting to be divided into acts and scenes is practically undivided), *Macbeth*, *Rich. II.*, *Lear*, and *Cymbeline* (which are divided, but not as in the Globe), *Tempest* (which is the only one of the sixteen agreeing with the

Globe division), and *Pericles*, which is not in the Folio of 1623.

Next, to familiarize the eye with the context, each reference must be located, seriatim, in the Globe edition by the help of Schmidt's Lexikon. The first two in *Troilus and Cressida* are very near the end of the play, and so are found without difficulty in both Folio and Quarto. *Macbeth*, IV., i., 134, is found in a moment, by the context. *Lear* V., ii., 235, is near the end, and for that reason soon lighted upon (in the Pide Bull it is spelt "ay"). *Cymbeline*, IV., iv., 27, is hit upon without trouble, for the scene number here agrees. *Tempest*, II., i., 285, occurs in a long scene and is most easily looked for by noting that it falls in Antonio's longest speech therein. *Tempest*, IV., 218, is found by running the eye up and down two or three columns. *Hamlet*, III., ii., 210, requires a little search, but we observe that it lies about the middle of the player-king's longest speech, and in turn look for this until it is found, there being no divisions to guide the eye after the 2d Act. *Midsummer Night's Dream*, I., i., 71 and 90, are both in speeches of Theseus, and are located by the context (in the second instance it is spelt "aie" in the Folio, but not so in the Roberts and Fisher Quartos). *Mid. N. D.*, III., ii., 387, falls in a terribly long scene of 464 lines, and the Folio is divided into acts only, so that it must be hunted for by the aid of a tolerable acquaintance with the context and after a little thumbing, it being remembered that the line sought is the last in one of Puck's speeches. (In the marginal act-scene-and-line notation of the Furnivall-Ebsworth-Griggs Quartos, the line-number is found to be 400, and not the 387 of the Globe.) *Richard II.*, V., ii., 40, is identified by lying at the end of York's long speech. *Troilus and Cressida*, III., ii., 167, involves quite a long hunt, being about the middle of an undivided play, and is picked out after reading all of Troilus's longer speeches in that neighborhood. It is more readily located in the 1609 Quarto reprint, for Mr. Griggs has line-numbered his text in conformity with the Globe notation; it is there misprinted "age." *Timon*, V., i., 55, and V., iv., 78, have to be run to earth, because the play is not divided. *Pericles*, V., iii., 94, is distinguished in the Quartos by being in Gower's epilogue.

All this is tedious to rehearse, and much more tedious to do. By actual count, 65 minutes were consumed in this collation of only 16 texts; the barren result being to establish that the word is spelt once "aie," once "ay," once misprinted "age," and for the rest uniformly "aye." So the conjecture is reluctantly laid on the shelf for the present, in the faint hope that, sometime, examples may be stumbled upon of "aye" being pronounced in rhyme like "I," or of the printed "I," where commonly taken to mean the pronoun or the affirmative, admitting also equivalence with "aye"—ever.

The Globe numbering, because of its convenience, took hold almost immediately upon the appearance of the volume. It filled an evident want. Had any of the four reprints of the First Folio, or of the many reprints of the Quartos, been intelligently line-numbered at the start, they would have promptly become standards of reference, in the same way as the Globe.

A good many of the Quarto reprints are line-numbered—but how? By following the act-scene-and-line notation of the Globe. Most of the Griggs Prætorius fac-similes do this. Some of them have special notation, as the 1603 *Hamlet* (with which the series began)—which, in addition to the Globe notation, is divided into consecutive scenes, 18 in all, but without act-division, each scene being independently line-numbered. So, also, with the *Merry Wives*, 1602, *The Taming of a Shrew*, 1594, and the two *Henry V.* Quartos, 1600 and 1608.

In some cases a composite notation is adopted. In Mr. P. A. Daniel's parallel texts of *Romeo and Juliet* (New Shakspeare Society, 1874), the marginal division of the fuller Quarto 2 is into acts and scenes, and each scene is line-numbered, not however to correspond with the Globe standard but serially as the lines run in the Quarto imprint; while the shorter Quarto 1 of 1597 is arbitrarily numbered to match the other. Dr Brinsley Nicholson's parallel volume of the first Quarto and the Folio of *Henry V.* (New Shakspeare Society, 1877) has both texts numbered by act, scene, and old-text scene-line, so that the line-numbers of the two pages do not agree and the parallelism is only apparent

to the eye. Examples of variant numeration might be indefinitely prolonged.

The simple fact is that what little approach is visible toward a uniform system of notation for critical reprints of the old Folio and Quarto texts springs from the attempt to refer the old text to the act-scene-and-line numbering of the Globe edition. This is unquestionably a convenience. I think that no reprint of an old Shakespearian text, making any claim to critical accuracy, should henceforth appear which does not, on one of its margins, indicate the Globe reference numbers, which, apparently, have "come to stay." The other margin should have an independent numeration peculiar to the particular old copy which is reproduced, so as to attach to it a common standard of reference, apart from the Globe standard.

If we pick up a modern critical edition of almost any classical or archaic text, we find that it has a system of reference-notation which enables a phrase to be readily indicated and at once singled out. Prose writings are mostly paragraph- or section-numbered, poems line-numbered. The continental classical epics or metrical romances, such as the *Livre d'Alexandre*, the *Poema del Cid*, the *Poema de Alfonso Oncena*, the *Nibelungen*, the *Gedichte of Walther von der Vogelweide*, are all line-numbered. So too are our Chaucer and Spenser. This convenient system comes to an abrupt halt at the threshold of the drama, where it is most needed—for of all awkward schemes of notation, the act-and-scene division is the clumsiest for instant reference.

I claim that a standard archaic text, which has become a daily resort for precise reference, as the 1623 Folio and the early Quartos of Shakespeare's plays have become, should be continuously line-numbered, following the typographical lines of the original copy from the first to the last, and including *every word of the author's composition*—stage-directions as well as text—so that a single reference-number will locate a line once for all, whether in the original or in a critical fac-simile reprint.

It has been the custom, heretofore, in all schemes of refer-

ence numeration, to pass over the stage-directions and to number only the printed metrical or prose lines of the dialogue. Yet the stage-directions are often, for the purposes of critical examination, of equal value with the spoken text. Archaic words or uses of words occur in the stage-business even more frequently than in the speeches. What the author briefly tells the actor to do, or tells the reader that the actor is doing, is often one of those firm, comprehensive touches that go to the making up of a masterpiece. From every point of view, critical, historical, histrionical, or philological, the stage directions deserve to be included in a systematic notation. It is especially so in the case of the Shakespeare Folios and Quartos, where moot questions of priority of composition and of publication, the identity of transcription, whether the play has been set up from a legitimate manuscript or from short-hand notes surreptitiously taken during public representation and read aloud to the compositor, and the like problems, may be as much elucidated by the unspoken directions as by the dialogue.

For instance, in the comparison of the old Quarto text of the First Part of the Contention, 1594, with the revised whole Contention, 1619, and with the Folio copy of 2 *Henry VI.*, the stage business plays an important part, for it is found, time and again, to be identical in the three, thus bridging over the gap of twenty-nine years which is unspanned by the conspicuously amended texts of the successive issues.

Take this direction as a sample :

"Enter at one Doore the Armorer and his Neighbors, drinking to him so much, that hee is drunke ; and he enters with a Drumme before him, and his Staffe, with a Sand-bagge fastened to it : and at the other Doore his Man, with a Drumme and Sand-bagge, and Prentices drinking to him."
(2 *Henry VI.*, Fo. 129^a, top.)

So the Folio. The 1619 and 1594 texts agree, with the single exception that the peculiar participial form of the Folio, *drunke*, appears in the more primitive shape, *drunken*, in the earlier texts. The Folio also marks the then growing tendency to capitalize substantives in the newly fashionable continental

way, and to needlessly double the consonants, as in "Drumme" for the "drum" of the Quarto. Passing by the grammatical aspects, an interesting thing about this passage is its view of manners and customs. The deadly sand-bag is therein mentioned twice, and for the only times in all the Plays, so far as I know, for the word is nowhere found in the dialogue text from which concordances and glossaries are made. The picture which is conjured up of the drunken Armorer, and his antagonist, each with a drum—and armed with a sand-bag attached, in flail-fashion, to a cudgel—ready for the combat which is so soon to result fatally to the traitor, is graphic to the life. It is as integrally a part of the play as the dialogue descriptive of the fight, which follows it. But the concordances and the lexicons, and the line-numbers of all the editions, skip it. If I wished to make a precise reference to it, I would be puzzled to indicate its location concisely by any systematic notation. It seems barbarous to have to say that it is to be found "between lines 58 and 59 of 2 *Hen. VI.*, II., iii., Globe ed.:" or as at the "top of col. 1 of p. 129 of the Histories in Fo. 1:" or as being "sig. D verso, lines 18-21, of The Whole Contention, Prætorius's facsimile, pt. 1:" or as "p. 28, lines 27-31, Halliwell's reprint of The Contention, 1594, First Sketch of 2 *Hen. VI.*, Old Sh. Soc'y, 1843."

The valuable stage-directions of the old texts count by hundreds. They narrate a good part of the history found in the English series, and, by describing actions which are mentioned by the Chroniclers, but which are not referred to in the dialogue, they form an additional indication of the closeness with which the old historians were followed in the plays. What would *Henry VIII.* be without them? * The description of the royal procession and entrance which prefaces the Trial scene,

* "Many of the stage directions in this play are very remarkable, and are evidently written with great care. The modern editors have for the most part retained their substance, and in some cases their words. We shall more closely follow the original, with such slight changes as are absolutely necessary to make the scene intelligible." (Knight, *Pict. Sh. Histories*, v. II., p. 341.)

Act II., sc. iv., is as serviceable a reproduction of the slightly spectacle as a painting by Veronese; but gorgeous as it is, it is eclipsed by the Order of the Coronation, Act IV., sc. i., which takes up 31 unnumbered lines of the Globe. The Procession is in substantial agreement with the accounts of Holinshed and Cavendish, and the Coronation is condensed with great exactness from Hall.

Moreover, the stage directions furnish the student with instructive examples of archaic words and uses of words not found elsewhere in the plays, and as much *hapax legomenon* as any once-used word of the dialogue. Again, they illustrate the conditions of early stage representation, often primitive to a degree difficult to realize nowadays, as in *Cymbeline*, p. 376, col. 1, line 4 from bottom, Fo. 1—"Enter Imogen, in her Bed, and a Lady." Here, as in Heywood's *A Woman Kild with Kindness* (Pearson's reprint, v. 2, p. 154)—"Enter Mistris Frankeford in her bed," and as in Brome's *A Mad Couple Well Match'd* (Pearson's reprint, Act IV., sc. iii., p. 73)—"The Bed put forth, Alicia in it"—there being no change of scene possible, a bed, with the personage upon it, asleep, was actually thrust forth upon the stage. But of the vivid trait thus presented, there is not a suggestion in the editions prepared for the "common reader." Even Richard Grant White, who stood up as a doughty champion for the authority and comparative purity of the Folio text, and who could not admit so much as a single word from the Quartos without enclosing it in denunciatory brackets, hewed and hacked the stage-directions mercilessly, as every editor from Rowe's time has done. Rowe's direction here is elaborate enough, but White's is more so, and the reader is to behold, in his mind's eye—"IMOGEN'S Bed-chamber; in one part of it a Trunk. IMOGEN reading in her bed; a Lady attending." It is so throughout the plays—the stage-directions, instead of being offered to our view "cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued the," are "mained, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious impostors, that expos'd them:" in the most injurious and stealthy of all forms

of imposition upon the credulous reader—that of silent emendation at the mere whim of the editor.

The stage-directions of the old copies, and especially of the First Folio, which is in most cases the only canon to which we may appeal with any show of authority, should be held as sacred as the text itself, and not departed from, or added to, without critical cause and due announcement.

For this reason, the stage business, even to the single word "Exit" when it stands as a line by itself, should be scrupulously numbered in the reference canon. The same, too, of the line of type, whenever it occurs, denoting act and scene; for this is only found in half the plays in the Folio, and where it exists it is as much a part of the record as any other phrase.

If the Folio and Quartos were numbered as suggested, every line of type (except the head-lines and the catch-words, which belong to the printer and not to the stage copy) being consecutively noted, from "*Actus Primus. Scena Prima*" to "*Finis*," reference to every jot and tittle of the original text would be simplicity itself. How much easier to say "*Tempest*, F., 2936" or "*Q.*, 3153," *Hamlet* than to give a reference to act, scene, and line (which, as we have seen, helps little or not at all in the old copies), or to devise such barbarous constructions as these—in the effort to be precise:

"Com. of Err. Fo. 1623, p. 88 (misprint for 86) col. 1, 1. 24."

"Tro. & Cres. Fo. 1, sig. ¶ ¶ 2 verso, col. 1, 1. 14 from bottom."

"Rich. III., Qo. 1597, sig. H, 8th page, line 3 from bottom."

"What, will the Line stretch out to' th' cracke of Doome."

Besides the line-numbers, every reprint of an old text (except of course page-for-page fac-similes) should denote on one margin the beginning of each page and column of the Folios or signature-leaf of the Quarto. For the Folio, it suffices to print the brief indication in full-faced (Clarendon) type behind a single bracket, thus, [218a. by common consent signifies the first column of page 218. To fix the signature-leaf of the Quartos requires a somewhat more conventional treatment, for the last leaf of each signature is generally unsigned. I observe among

authorities a want of uniformity as to this class of references which will be found briefly mentioned in a foot-note. In the New Shakspeare Society's reprints, Dr. Brinsley Nicholson denotes the eight pages of a signature thus: B — B v — B 2 — B 2 v — B 3 — B 3 v — B 4 — B 4 v — (or at least, in his *Henry V.*, Q₁ and F₁ texts, he should do so, but by error the last leaf repeats "B 3" and "B 3 v," which is confusing), and he marks the end of the old page, not the beginning as is most natural and usual. Mr. Furnivall has a way of his own—as he has in most things, and a pretty good way it is apt to be—and he marks the signature pagination, at the beginning of each page, through the four leaves, thus: sig. B—sig. B, back—sig. B 2—sig. B 2, back—sig. B 3—sig. B 3, back—leaf B 4—leaf B 4, back. But, on the whole, I prefer the simpler notation of Dr. Nicholson, when set in the right place at the head of the page and not at the tail.

It seems to me, as I hope it will seem to you, that the critical reader, however humble the sphere of his criticism, has a right to a simple but uniform and immutable reference-standard. He needs, in the first place, a Canon, and in the second, the means of readily consulting it by means of a uniform system of line-notation covering the whole of the authoritative text. He needs, it is undeniable, a great deal else—and Time may eventually produce from the well-stored wallet at his back reprints of all the Folios, line-numbered as herein suggested, and produced with all the perfection of the new photozincographic processes to which we owe the delicate reproductions of pen-drawings which have supplanted engravings in the pages of *Puck* and *Life*. There is, or should be, no excuse nowadays for blurred and misty reprints of old texts. The marvellous accuracy of reproduction which can give us the 799 pages of Skeat's Etymological Dictionary in a perfectly clear reduced form, and spread before us with microscopic perfection the eight column blanket-sheet of a daily newspaper in the compass of 4½x6 inches, is certainly capable of doing better work than the blotchy and

slovenly impressions that come to us between the covers of the Griggs-Praetorius Quarto fac-similes.*

The chief merit of the suggestion now put forth is, however, that it is not necessary to wait for some new Lionel Booth or Howard Staunton to give us a reference reprint that will command our following. It would suffice for the inauguration of a lasting reform if the leading Shakespeare Societies of England, Germany, and America should, through a conference of delegates or otherwise, agree upon a canon and a systematic notation, so that henceforth the texts published under the sanction of each Society should conform to the adopted standard, which should follow the text of the Third Period Grenville copy in the British Museum.

Our own Society is in a position to set the ball in motion, by incorporating the new notation in its now issuing Bankside Edition of the parallel texts of all the plays found in Quarto form anterior to the First Folio, which is certainly the first and most complete comprehensive series of critical parallel texts as yet attempted. And the main object of this paper is to draw from our members an expression of their views on the subject, in order that the individual editors of the several volumes of the Bankside Shakespeare may, under the direction of the Society, as a whole, pursue their labors in perfect accord, and with acceptable results.

A. A. ADEE.

A STUDY IN "*MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING*."



MUCH *Ado About Nothing* was the first of a series of brilliant comedies. It was printed originally in 1600 in the form of a quarto, by V. S. (Valentine Sims) for Andrew Wise and William Aspley. It is entered in the Register of the Stationer's Company on the 23d of August in that year. A previous reference to it, and the first we have

* "Any subscriber willing to undertake the hanging or burning of a photo-lithographer or two—to encourage the others—should apply to F. J. FURNIVALL." (Corrections to Praetorius's *Hen. V.*, Q₁, 1600.)

of the play, is in the same Register under date of 4th August, 1600, when it is "to be staied."

There are two facts which enable us to form a very accurate opinion as to the *date* of the play. As it was published in Aug., 1600, and had, as the title-page informs us, "been sundrie times publiکly acted," it must have been written previous to that time.

The other fact is — Francis Meres in his "*Palladis Tamia*,"* printed in Sept., 1598, a book that contains the most complete and accurate account of Shakespeare's writings up to that time, makes mention of twelve of the plays as being well known. In this list *Much Ado About Nothing* is not mentioned. To be sure, this is only negative evidence, but Meres has proven himself so exact and well informed a bibliographer, that it is not likely he would have omitted this play if it had been in print. I think, therefore, we can assign as the date of the play sometime before Sept., 1598, and Aug., 1600. Of the earlier editors whose opinion on this subject is of value, Steevens and Malone both thought the play was written in 1600. The later editors generally accept that year. Mr. H. P. Stokes thinks "1599 or in the succeeding year."†

THE TEXT.

None of the plays have come down to us in a more perfect condition than *Much Ado About Nothing*. In the Quarto we have it almost exactly as it came from the author's own hand, printed doubtless from the original manuscript in the possession of, and belonging to, the Globe Theatre Company. In the Folio we have it as it was acted in his own theatre, under his own supervision, and with the revisions as to stage directions, distribution of speeches, etc., which would be suggested by his experience both as an actor and as a stage manager.

The connection between dramatic writers and the theatre at that time was so intimate that most all dramatists were actors as well. We know that Shakespeare, Marlowe, Lodge,

* Cf. J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, "Outlines, etc," 2d edition, pp. 503-506. Ingleby, "Centurie of Prayse," pp. 21-23.

† "Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays," p. 75.

Wilson, Munday, and many others both wrote and played, and this certainly appears to have been the rule.

"From the time that Shakespeare had the superintendence of a play-house, that is, from the year 1603," as Henslowe's Diary abundantly and everywhere proves, "the play itself was the property of the company, and exposed to any alterations and 'additions,' which, while they 'made' it on the stage, might 'mar' it . . . for all future ages."

The *variations* between the *text* of the Quarto and that of the Folio are not many or of great importance. The number of lines in each proves this, the Quarto having 2556, the Folio 2679. The lines of the former are longer, contain more words than those of the latter. This accounts for most of the difference. The Folio has no material addition to the text as found in the Quarto. The only two variations worthy of consideration consist of the omission of two passages, which are found in the Quarto, and which were unquestionably in Shakespeare's MS. The first of these is: ". . . or, in the shape of two counties at once, as a Germaine from the waste downward, all Slops, and a Spaniard from the hip upward, no dublet."* Malone encloses this passage in brackets and makes this comment: "Or, 'in the shape,' etc., to 'no dublet' were omitted in the Folio, probably to avoid giving any offence to the Spaniards, with whom James became a friend in 1604." Halliwell-Phillips quotes this and then adds: "Capell ingeniously suggests that the passage was omitted because the Spanish match was on foot in 1623, and that there is no doubt the First Folio was in type before that year."†

Richard Grant White differs from Malone. "That part of the allusion to the aping of foreign fashions that time out of mind has been characteristic of the English race . . . is found only in the Quarto. It seems not to have been stricken

* Lines 1165-1167 inclusive. Reference is to Bankside Edit. of this play. The English of that day took their fashions in dress from the Continental nations. Cf. Bishop Hall's "Quo Vadis, or a Censure of Travel," Vol. XII., Sec. 22.

† Halliwell-Phillips Edition, Vol. 4, p. 119.

out by the author; for without it, Benedick's 'foolery' would be somewhat incomplete."

Some lines of the Quarto are omitted in the Folio unintentionally, doubtless owing to the carelessness of the printers,* but the omission of this particular passage is accounted for by the fact that King James wished a marriage between his son and the Infanta of Spain, and for that purpose began a prolonged negotiation with the Spanish Court. He would therefore be careful to avoid giving the Spaniards any offence and instruct the proper officers to take out of any plays proposed for public representation anything which might bear an unpleasant construction. (The other passage to which I alluded is, lines 1919-1922, Quarto, an examination of which will follow later.) In everything relating to what is technically known as stage business the Folio is more correct. The Quarto is not divided into acts or scenes. The Folio has five acts and Act I. has *Scena Prima*: says Halliwell-Phillipps.† "The arrangement of the First Folio in respect to the acts is that which is still generally adopted, and was, in all probability, the same that was in vogue in the author's own time."

The Folio has five more Exits than the Quarto.‡ The distribution of speeches in the Folio is more accurate. The punctuation, orthography, use of capital letters, in the Folio, is an improvement on the Quarto. In these points, and these alone, is the Folio superior to the Quarto. There is not the slightest evidence that Heminge and Condell did any editorial work. They printed, not from the original MSS., but from a copy of the Quarto; and, there is every reason to think, from the copy which had been in use in the theatre. In Quarto, line 805, the text is: "*Enter Prince, Leonato, Claudio, Musicke,*" and in line 812, "*Enter Balthaser with Musicke.*" The corresponding line in Folio (866) is: "*Enter Prince, Leonato, Claudio, and Jacke Wilson.*"

Jacke Wilson was undoubtedly the actor who assumed the

* For instance, lines 269, 270, 1584.

† See his edition of *Much Ado About Nothing*, p. 305.

‡ Folio, lines 1041, 1149, 1326, 1652, 2410.

character of Balthaser, and in the copy of the Quarto in the library of the theatre, and used as the prompter's book, a memorandum to this effect was probably made, which was followed by the printer of the Folio.

The same is true in the case of the Constables, Quarto, 1902 seq. Here, instead of the characters, are printed the names of the actors, Cowley, Andrew, and Kemp. In this instance, also, the Folio is only a reprint of the Quarto.

I give preference to the text of the Quarto, believing that it was printed directly from the original mss. The Folio differs very little from that, and those differences in most cases are not the result of careful, editorial revision, but are transcripts of alterations or revisions made in the theatre copy of the Quarto, and which were necessary for putting the play on the stage. As to this Halliwell-Phillipps says:

"If it be supposed that in the case of *Much Ado About Nothing*, for instance, the printed copy supplied, after the year 1600, the place of the original manuscript, a rational explanation is afforded of the singular circumstance that, whereas the Folio is proved to have been printed from the Quarto by the substitution of the names of Kemp (in both misprinted, in one instance, Keeper) and Cowley, for those of *Dogberry* and *Verges*, the former has another theatrical allusion, one to Jack Wilson, which is not found in the Quarto. Mr. Knight's conclusion, therefore, that the text of this play in the Folio 'was printed from the play-house copy,' appears to me to be incontrovertible; and the circumstances above mentioned seem to prove satisfactorily that that play-house copy was the printed edition, containing certain manuscript corrections and additional memoranda."* And the Cambridge editors remark:† "The First Folio Edition of this play (*M. A. About N.*) was obviously printed from a copy of the Quarto belonging to the library of the theatre and corrected for the purposes of the stage. Some stage directions of interest occur first in the Folio, but as regards the text, where the Folio differs from the Quarto it differs almost

* Edition, Vol I., pp. 287, 288.

† Edition 1863, Vol II., Pref., p. vii.

always for the worse. The alterations are due, however, to accident, not design.

WILLIAM H. FLEMING.

(To be continued.)

THE CHILDREN IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS.

THE great poet loves to play with children, to watch their pretty antics, and laugh at their innocent and searching wit; to weep over them in their summer-beauty, when Death has despoiled it with his grim touch. He jokes gayly with the prattling child, whose open eyes gaze in wondering astonishment at the wickedness of the world, and laughingly satisfies all eager questions. He reasons gravely with the older boy who has more worldly knowledge, who boastfully talks of the place he expects to win, and of the battles he will fight on the world's great arena.

His little friends are all wise with childlike wisdom; which, perhaps, is best of all, since they are fresh from the hands of God. They are gentle, tender, and loving; often sad; again gay and sporting with youthful lightness of heart. Sometimes they are cruel in their unconsciousness, innocently wounding friends; at other times they are careless of the wounds they inflict upon their enemies. Some are rather pert and precocious; withal manly, upright, honorable little fellows, courageous and truthful as only pure-souled children can be.

The two young princes in *Richard the Third*, though brothers, are entirely different. The elder prince is a wholesome inquisitive, and diplomatic boy. He has an instinctive dread of his uncle; yet the thoughtful and cautious little statesman knows well how to conceal it. He can show quiet independence, and courage too; as when, to Richard's hypocritical prayer: "God keep you from your uncles and such false friends," he firmly answers: "God keep me from false friends! but they were none." With a half presentiment of coming grief overshadowing his spirit, always rather disposed to melancholy, he wakes

from a solemn-eyed, old-fashioned youth to a bright, courageous young soldier, when he vows with a touch of boyish boastfulness, "An if I live to be a man, I'll win back our ancient right in France." He is uneasy about his mother, and wants more uncles there to welcome him; but, like the little prince and gentleman that he is, replies gently and with quiet dignity to the false welcomes and wishes of Gloucester. Gentle, wise, firm, manly, courageous, and dignified, he gave great promise of autumn fruit; but "so wise, so young, they say, do ne'er live long." Well may he go to the Tower with a heavy heart thinking on these things.

York—"ay, there's a colt indeed," cunning and so young withal; a witty, sharp-tongued fellow, who shoots his arrows right and left, caring not whose tender skin they wound or what wrath they arouse. The gloomy, ugly, satirical Richard does not in the least frighten this precocious infant, who chaffs and aptly taunts him, until the quiet prince is obliged to make excuses: "My lord of York will still be cross in talk, uncle; your Grace knows how to bear with him." He is evidently the spoiled youngest son, the pet of his grandam, who openly encourages him to give his "Uncle's Grace a flout" with his "sharp-provided" wit. Though so youthful, so indulged and petted, there is very little that is childlike about York, except when he asks for the dagger; but he soon sharpens his tongue again, when Richard refuses: "Ah, there I see, you part with but light gifts." Of course, one must rejoice in seeing Gloucester well mocked at; but the goodwives would love little York much better, if he were to display more wholesome awe of his elders; and, after listening with a disapproving shake of the head to gibes, mocks, and scornings, would fain exclaim with Elisabeth: "A parlous boy. Go to! you are too shrewd."

Grumbling, he wends his way to the Tower, prating all the time of his Uncle Clarence, whom, his grandam had said, they murdered there; truly a pleasant subject to soothe Richard!

Though York may be "bold, quick, ingenious, forward and capable," it is the thoughtful, child-hearted Prince whom we love with all our hearts, until every thought is melted into

tenderness and compassion, as we weep over the "death's sad story" of these innocent babes.

Arthur has all of the Prince's gentleness, with a good share of York's quickness, tempered by a naturally sweet and amiable disposition. He is an affectionate, mild, yet high-spirited boy, who now shows the innocence and playfulness of a child, and again a man's courage, eloquence, and wit. Invited by his mother, he braves his uncle's wrath, while he is either indifferent, through ignorance, to the power and greatness of the throne, or he is too young in heart to care for aught save boyish dreams and pretty little princesses who wrought him handkerchiefs. There is always a sadness about Arthur's spirit, even when at liberty. He only asks for peace and quiet, and, when his wrongs might well have roused a gentle bosom, answers Constance's wild passions with: "I pray you, madame, be content." When in prison, he thinks that no one should be sad but he; yet, with all his heaviness of heart, he can ask tenderly after the health of his rough jailer: "Are you sick, Hubert? You look pale to-day." He merely indulges in mild wonder, that his crafty uncle can fear a little prince with only a great title, who would be merry as the day is long, so he were out of prison and kept sheep on any hill. Yet, in prison, sad and longing for freedom, he would like to sit all night and watch with the very men who kept him there. He could well say to Hubert: "I warrant I love you more than you do me." We hardly know what a high-spirited, eloquent little pleader he can be, until—with all the art of artlessness—he begs for his eyes "that never did so much as frown." He brings love, shame, gratitude, helplessness, all to bear on Hubert's resolution; he reminds the stern jailer how, at midnight, he had held his aching brow, when many a poor man's son would have lain still; then, with a reasoning child-like, yet persuasive and wise, he adds: "Nay, you may think my love was crafty and call it cunning; do so an you will." With such pleading, cruelty itself could not resist him; and when the pitiful reasoner declares, like any naughty child: "I will stand stock still;" and then, wild with terror and fright, breaks into the agonized cry: "O, Hubert, spare me, spare me!" Hubert

gives way and vows: "Pretty child, sleep doubtless and secure, That Hubert for all the wealth o' the world, will not offend thee." Once more the boy cries out to us, as he makes a last, desperate venture for blessed freedom: "Ah me, my uncle's spirit is in these stones!" Well might those stone walls echo that cry, since it was "by John's damned hands, that Arthur's jewel of life was robbed and ta'en away."

Mamillius is an embryo dandy and a great chatterer, too. He is not old enough to have much book-lore, but he is full of quaint, childish learning about ghosts and sprites and old tales that crones tell in firelight. He is so solemn and owl-like, as he whispers softly of churchyards, that it is well we have seen him only a moment ago, like any healthy, every-day boy, trouble his mother, till he is "past endurance." My gracious lord does not mind any rebuff, however, and, aping the dandy, answers the court ladies. Not one whit abashed by all their attentions, he gayly chatters away. In a lordly manner he rejects one of them: "I'll have none of you. You'll kiss me hard and speak to me as if I were a baby still." He soon proves, by his wonderful lecture on female eyebrows, that he does not deserve a baby's treatment. He is a severe critic. He likes not a lady with a blue nose; he is really alarming us by his learning that he got out of women's faces, when he suddenly becomes a child again. He nestles up to Hermione and, peeping wisely from under her sheltering arms, offers, as all real children do, to tell a tale of goblins and sprites. It begins in the style of good, old-fashioned stories: "There was a man." Mamillius whispers low—for the wonderful man dwelt where churchyards yawn; he sharply looks to see whether we shiver; but Leontes entering stops forever the story. It was to have been a sad one: "A sad tale's best for winter," he says; and on this childish cue the dramatist has called his own drama, "*The Winter's Tale*."

Mamillius startles with his knowledge and amuses with his prattle; though he has so much of the baby about him, he has enough of York's spirit, that, were he opposed to an uncle's harshness, he would undoubtedly make that unfortunate man

long for the tomb. Indeed, one often wonders whether Leontes did not feel the sting of the child's plain-spoken wit when Mamillius discovered Hermione's fate. Yet, with all the sharpness and bluntness that made the court-ladies wince, our little man is a loving fellow, who cheers his mother's weary hours, and loves her with the warmth of his heart, a heart not the less tender because he chatters at the wrong time. During the long years of her exile Hermione must have often yearned to open her arms to the merry boy, and shout: "Come now, I'm for you again."

Macduff's son, even in his tragic death, does not awaken our sympathy and love as do our other little friends. He is truly a brave child to call a cruel ruffian a "shag-haired villain;" but then he is too sage and long-headed. What might he have become if fate had spared him? He has so much knowledge now. Why, young as he is, he knows all about traps set for rich men, traitors, liars, and swearers. He makes a few innocent and childlike remarks about living as birds do; but such a wiseacre would not possibly have lived in that unworldly style, as he hints he would probably have looked out for a new father. In his death, however, he shows his loving heart, as he cries to his mother to save herself from the fate that has overtaken him.

All these children, in different ways, are attractive. This worldly-wise little man, merry, happy, winsome Mamillius; even the gibing York; and, above all, the children of an older growth, the wise Arthur and the gentle Prince; all are bright with the heavenly colors, in which the creations of the master-poet are painted.

HELEN MAR BRIDGES.

JAMES ORCHARD HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS.

JAMES ORCHARD HALLIWELL was born in Chelsea, in London, in 1820. His first appearance in literature was "A Brief Account of the Life, Writings, and Invention of Sir Samuel Moreland, Master of Mechanics to Charles the Second," a modest little

8vo, published in Cambridge in 1838, its author being, it seems, already, at the age of eighteen, immersed in the archæological studies, which he never relinquished until death, at the ripe age of sixty-eight, overtook him in the midst of his great collections, his pen in hand and his treasured associates around him. This modest work was followed the next year by an edition of the works of Sir John Mandeville, which first attracted attention to his abilities and began the reputation which was to be added to so constantly that in 1881 the Librarian of Harvard College was able to contribute to the bibliographical collections of that institution a list of two hundred and sixty-two works edited or composed by him—inclusive of his immortal folio Shakespeare in twenty volumes. In 1840 Mr. Halliwell was appointed examiner of manuscripts in the Chetham Library of Manchester, which institution was founded by Sir Thomas Chetham, merchant, of that town, a contemporary of William Shakespeare (1580–1653), and which still preserves his quaint collection of volumes which made the nucleus of the present library which bears his name.

Mr. Halliwell soon became attracted to the Elizabethan branch of his chosen field of Archæology, and to the foremost figure of that era; and in 1840 he—in conjunction with Payne Collier; the secretary, Mr. F. G. Tomlins; the treasurer, Mr. Dilke, grandfather of the present Sir Charles Dilke; Rev. William Harness, Charles Knight, Campbell, the poet; Macready, Alexander Dyce, Douglas Jerrold, Sergeant Talfourd, Thomas Wright, and Young the tragedian; and shortly afterward Bolton Corney, Charles Dickens, Henry Hallam, J. R. Planché, and Peter Cunningham, Mr. Dilke, Boyle Bernard, Knight Bruce, John Forster, Rev. H. H. Milman, and Sir George Rose—founded the Shakespeare Society, which came to an untimely end through the discovery of the Collier forgeries of 1865.

Owing to the change in name, by which James Orchard Halliwell became J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, a change which is said to have been a condition to the acceptance of a fortune bequeathed to him, two distinct epochs appear in his life. He used his wealth always and exclusively to further his re-

searches. Some of his publications appealed to so narrow a circle of readers that very small editions were printed, the cost of books dear to the bibliophile being to some extent offset by the value they attained owing to their rarity. But there is not a volume under his name which has not the largest value for his disciples, and those who follow in the studies that were so near and dear to him.

Of the three classes of people with whom the name Halliwell has been for the last forty years one to conjure by—students of English, because of the sterling value of his “Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words,” now about to be superseded by the New Dictionary founded on the Philological Society’s materials (third edition of 1855); students of English life, manners, and customs in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, and the great army of Shakespearians—the last have reaped the greatest benefit from Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps’s labors, for since 1843, when he published an account of the only known manuscript of Shakespeare’s plays, and 1851, when he edited “A Neat Boke about Shakespeare,” down to his most recent researches in the garrets of old houses of Stratford-on-Avon, he has been true to his passion.

The folio edition of Shakespeare will remain the largest record of this antiquary in the very long list of his publications. It was issued by subscription, was to have been in 20 volumes, and cost \$210. In 1855, when five had been issued, the price was advanced to \$315, but as it was promised that only 150 copies should be printed, the subscribers were, doubtless, willing enough. This magnificent edition of Shakespeare, in fifteen folio volumes, was then in course of publication, five volumes having appeared. This is his *magnum opus*, as editor. It presents a thorough collation of the early editions of the poet’s works, all the original novels and tales on which the plays are founded, copious archaeological illustrations to each play, and a life of the poet. As the edition was limited to 150 copies, it is now hard to obtain. When a copy comes into the market, by the sale of a private library, it commands a high price. A copy was sold in Philadelphia, a few years ago, for \$1200.

It would be impossible to say which of Mr. Halliwell-Phillips's vast list comes next to this in importance. He so assiduously, incessantly, and minutely hunted for every scrap of information, so ransacked the great book-rooms, muniment and manuscript rooms of every ancient building in England, and so faithfully reported the results in pamphlet or diagram, that no comparative estimate can be made where all are unique and invaluable. But by some his name is better known to a less limited field than by others. Such monumental works as "*Morte d'Arthur* from the *Lincoln Manuscripts*," "*Two Essays on Numerical Calculation*," "*Collection of Pieces in the Dialect of Zimmerzet*" (1843), "*Early History of Freemasonry in England*" (1844), "*Groteste's Castle of Love*," quarto, "*Illustrations of the History of Prices*," "*Jokes of the Cambridge Coffee-Houses in the Seventeenth Century*," "*The Voiage and Travaille*" of Sir John Mandeville, "*The Connexion of Wales with the Early Science of England*," "*The Harrowing of Hell*" (1840), and "*Popular Rhymes and Nursery Tales*" (1849), most readily occur to us.

In consequence of Mr. Halliwell's devotion to themes dear to antiquaries and his taste for publishing books that require learning and leisure to edit, whenever book collectors see his name on a title-page they are sure to covet the volume. He was foremost in securing Shakespeare's home mansion at New Place, at Stratford-on-Avon, for the town corporation, and all must give him honor for his indefatigable zeal, continued long after he had passed his sixtieth year. Other men, having passed thirty or forty years working and publishing, and having received long past middle age a large fortune, would be apt to rest and leave the field to younger aspirants. But Mr. Halliwell-Phillips kept on producing long beyond the ordinary term of literary productiveness for the great majority of men. But Mr. Halliwell-Phillips's most memorable work—even greater than the great folio edition—is his "*OUTLINES*." In 1881 he printed at Brighton, "for presents only," "*Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*," on the title-page of which is a motto from the thirtieth Sonnet:

When to the sessions of sweet silent thought
I summon up remembrance of things past,
I sigh the lack of many a thing I sought."

The next year (1882), a second edition was published in London, by Longmans, Green & Co. Since then, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh editions have been published, the last in two large volumes. It is not likely that any scraps of knowledge will be added to what is contained in these volumes.

Under the title "The Story of a Great Biography," *SHAKESPEARIANA* printed on page 1 of Volume III. an adequate account of this immense work, of which Mr. Grant White said: "It is safe to say that, without consulting it, no one will hereafter undertake to write on a Shakespearian theme." Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, however, was not satisfied with the above results. He had in mind for the thirty years last past the preparation of a final work, and he was constantly collecting material for a "History of the English Stage." He had but little hope, years ago, that his life would be sufficiently prolonged for him to write this work, after finishing his Shakespearian researches. The material is so well arranged, every little scrap of knowledge having its place, that the future historian of the English stage can make easy use of it, and there is probably in his will (a copy of which has not, as we write this, reached the United States) minute directions as to who shall complete it. Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps a few years ago retired to Hollinbury Copse—one of the quaintest of houses, and of which our readers will find detailed description in *SHAKESPEARIANA* *—on the Sussex Downs, and no American Shakespearian will ever forget the hospitality, pressed down and running over, of this noble gentleman. It is safe to say that he leaves in England no successor. He leaves his library to his nephew, his invaluable collection of rarities to be sold at \$50,000, unless the Birmingham Library will pay \$35,000 for it, and his immense collection of electrotypes, cuts, and blocks, used in the printing of the 266 works above mentioned as well

* Volume I., page 226.

as in the several editions of the "OUTLINES," to the Shakespeare Society of New York, thus adding to the great art treasures, which are accumulating in the city of New York, which already possesses in its Astor, Lenox, and Columbia Libraries the larger portion of the existing Shakespeare Quartos and Folios.*

H. H. F.

*Wm. H. Fleming. See SHAKESPEARIANA, Vol. V., p. 101.

Editorial.

APROPOS of the rumor that Mr. Browning himself was not entirely unconnected with the suggestion of a proposal at a late session of the London Browning Society, "that the Society be dissolved," comes the very pertinent suggestion that gentlemen who are fond of inquiring what William Shakespeare would have said could he have heard some of the interpretations his worshippers supply to his words, interview Mr. Browning. Doubtless Shakespeare did not mean and could not have meant all the esoteric Buddhism, Rosicrucianism, eschatological, mystical "stuff" that is read out of him and from between his lines. Yet at least Shakespeare is dead, and cannot contradict his interpreters. But Mr. Browning is alive, and can not only tell how Shakespeare would feel were he still amongst us; but, what is more to the purpose, can set us all right if he has a mind. The question is sometimes asked, Will the study of Browning cast out the study of Shakespeare? Is not Shakespeare yielding to his nineteenth century antetype? From this standpoint we should incline to doubt it. The limitations of Browning study alone forbid it. How can we debate the meaning of a phrase, the tendency of a thought, the trend of a story, the morals of an episode, night after night, week after week, overhauling libraries for the least hint or suggestion so as to help us in our search, when the rare old poet himself is alive, and a postage-stamp will settle our quandary from the very pen of the poet himself? Here are no "drams of eale," no "Runaways eyes," no "mother was her painting." But grand Mr. Browning himself for a corrector and an elucidator.

Three hundred years from now, our progeny may study the Shakespeare of the nineteenth century. But, as Shakespeare's contemporaries were not obliged to found a Shakespeare Society for his study, so, living in the same days, and under the same skies, and in the midst of the same civilization as Browning himself, doubtless the days of the Browning

Club are as limited as the investigation. Still less will the Shakespeare of the nineteenth century drive out and dispel his master and ours, while SHAKESPERIANA's present generation of readers occupy themselves with its pages.

Miscellany.

THE history of Shakespearian commentary and criticism is the history of what one may dignify as "disputes," or smile at as "squabbles"—entirely as he happens to be in charitable or complaisant mood. Shakespeariana is a free field into which anybody, who can write grammatically, and who has access to a library, can write himself to his heart's content. Or, if he do not happen to have access to a library, he has simply to take the last thing written on the subject and contradict it. If the last thing written, for example, maintains that Hamlet was fat, let him demonstrate that Hamlet was lean; if it holds that Desdemona was a brunette, let him point out that she must have been a blonde to have attracted a copper-colored Othello—unless, indeed, Othello was a white man, which there is abundant text that can be twisted to prove, etc., etc., just as Sheridan's character wrote tragedies by simply reversing other people's comedies. There is absolutely nobody to interfere with him, and no data, one way or the other, to confront him with. Shakespeare himself has said something about everything (barring only perhaps tobacco), so the range of subjects is infinite, and, except the law, no topic of human interest has so religiously preserved its literature as has the exhaustless topic of Shakespeare. In other words, just as anybody can be a poet, so anybody can be a Shakespearian commentator. The recipe for either appears to be a quire of paper, a pen, and a bottle of ink.—*The Church Review*.

SIX thousand five hundred and ninety-eight new books and new editions were issued last year in England. The number of new books and new editions published in 1887 was 5688, so that

the increase over the previous year is 903, a large proportion of which consisted of books of fiction. The increase in 1887 over 1886 was 476, only a little more than half as much as the gain last year. It would probably be well within the mark to say that an average edition of 1500 of each of the 6591 books published in England last year was circulated. This estimate would make the total number of copies issued and circulated 9,886,500, and the readers of these volumes could fairly be numbered at between 25,000,000 and 30,000,000, though, owing to the number and popularity of circulating libraries in Great Britain, the actual figures, could they be obtained, would doubtless be found even greater.

There were published in the United States, in 1887, 4437 books, new issues, and new editions. The figures for 1888 are not likely to be much, if any, in excess of this total. In 1886 high-water mark in the publishing trade was touched, with 4676 new books, the following year showing a falling off of 239.

In the United States, the six most popular magazines have an aggregate monthly circulation of 600,000, the total number of copies distributed yearly amounting thus to over 7,000,000. Allowing eight readers for each monthly number, the total body of magazine readers is not far from 5,000,000. No class of literature in this country exerts so great an influence, and upon no class of literature is so much money spent annually by publishers. Of the above, 262 volumes in England and the United States (1887-1888) were devoted to Shakespearian (including Baconian) matters. America contributes the only magazine in the world devoted exclusively to Shakespeare—SHAKESPEARIANA—now prosperously beginning its sixth year, unless we count the *Jahrbuch*, which is an annual and comes from Germany.

DON QUIXOTE AND SHAKESPEARE.—The First Part of Don Quixote was licensed for the Press, December, 1604, and *The History of Sir John Oldcastle*, which is generally assigned to Munday, Drayton, Houghton, and Wilson, appeared for the

first time in 1600, and the scene in which Clun presents the heretical books condemned to the stake by the Bishop of Rochester, reads :

“ Away with them, to the fire,
Burn them, burn them quickly,”

is reproduced four years later by Cervantes, in his account of the library of Don Quixote, whose romances of chivalry are condemned by the curate, thus : “ Pegarlos fuego,” “ Vaya ei fuego : ” “ dellas en las del fuego,” etc. The identical words of the English drama are translated literally into Spanish.

As *You Like It* was written in or about 1599. The second part of Don Quixote was printed in 1615, and in Chapter XII., Don Quixote explains to Sancho how players and the stage represent the occurrences of human life, thus : “ No has visto tu representar alguna comedia adonde se introducen reyes, emperadores y pontifices, cabaleros, damos y otros diversos personajes ? ” Sancho replies : “ Brava comparacion ! aunque no tan nueva que yo no la haya oide muchas y diversas veces,” sixteen years before Jacques had said to the duke : “ All the world’s a stage, and all the men and women merely players.” *Macbeth*, in or about 1605 (II., 2), says : “ Sleep no more . . . sleep that knits up the ravelled sleeve of care, The death of each day’s life, great Nature’s second course, chief nourisher in life’s feast.” In 1615, Sancho repeats the first line almost letter for letter : “ Y bien haya el que invente *capa que cubre todos los humanos pensamientos*, manjar que quita la hambre, agua que ahuyenta la sed, fuego que calienta el frio, frio que templa el ardor, y finalmente moneda general con que todas las cosas se compran, balenza y peso que iguala al pastor con el rey, y al simple con el discreto ” (Part II., ch. 68). To this Don Quixote responded that he had never heard Sancho express himself so elegantly.—*The Athenæum*.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

From the New York Shakespeare Society, New York.

THE BANKSIDE SHAKESPEARE. Vol. III., *Romeo and Juliet*.
With Introduction by William Reynolds, A.M., LL.B. One
volume, 8vo.

PAPERS OF THE NEW YORK SHAKESPEARE SOCIETY, I.-VIII.,
Including the *Digesta Shakespeariana*. Two volumes, 32mo.

From Roberts Brothers, Boston.

THE PENTAMERON. Citation and Examination of William
Shakespeare—Minor Prose Pieces—Criticisms. By Walter
Savage Landor. One volume, 12mo.

From Longmans, Green & Co., New York and London.

PEN AND INK. Papers on Subjects of More or Less Importance.
By Brander Matthews. One volume, 12mo.

From Fords, Howard & Hulbert.

THE HUMAN MYSTERY IN HAMLET. An Attempt to Say an
Unsaid Word. By Martin W. Cooke, A.M. One volume.
12mo.